

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ANTOINE DESHAWN BARNES,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
VAN NESS,  
Defendant.

No. 1:20-cv-00625-NONE-EPG (PC)

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS

(Doc. Nos. 29, 30, 31, 32)

Antoine Barnes (“Plaintiff”) is a prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* with this civil rights action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On November 18, 2020, plaintiff filed a notice (Doc. No. 29), which the assigned magistrate judge construed as, among other things, a motion for an order under the All Writs Act. On December 3, 2020, plaintiff filed what the magistrate judge construed as a motion for injunctive relief. (Doc. No. 31.)

On December 3, 2020, the magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations, recommending “that Plaintiff’s filing (ECF No. 29), which the Court construes as a request for an order under the All Writs Act, be DENIED.” (Doc. No. 30 at p. 5.) On December 7, 2020, the magistrate issued findings and recommendations, recommending that “Plaintiff’s filing (ECF No. 31), which the Court construes as a motion for injunctive relief, be DENIED,” and that “[a]ll

1 future requests for injunctive relief that Plaintiff files be summarily denied if they are clearly  
2 unrelated to this case.” (Doc. No. 32 at p. 5.)

3 Plaintiff was provided an opportunity to file objections to both findings and  
4 recommendations. The deadline to file objections has passed and plaintiff has not filed objections  
5 or otherwise responded to either findings and recommendations.

6 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this court has conducted a  
7 *de novo* review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court concludes that the  
8 magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations are supported by the record and by proper  
9 analysis.

10 Accordingly,

- 11 1. The findings and recommendations issued on December 3, 2020, (Doc. No. 30),  
12 and the findings and recommendations issued on December 7, 2020, (Doc. No.  
13 32), are adopted in full;
- 14 2. Plaintiff’s November 18, 2020 filing, (Doc. No. 29), which the court construes as a  
15 request for an order under the All Writs Act, is denied;
- 16 3. Plaintiff’s December 3, 2020 filing, (Doc. No. 31), which the court construes as a  
17 motion for injunctive relief, is denied; and
- 18 4. All future requests for injunctive relief that plaintiff files will be summarily denied  
19 if they are clearly unrelated to this case.

20 IT IS SO ORDERED.

21 Dated: **January 25, 2021**

22   
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE